

Randall S. Marshall, RA. 5225 Ames Street, N. E. Washington, DC 20019



17 January 2002

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Attention: Mark Henderson

Dear Sir:

Enclosed, please find my "Official Response" to the advisory action of October 30, 2001 for patent application number 09/422,107 filed October 20, 1999 titled "Positional Lottery Bet Slip and Chart".

Very truly yours,

Randall S. Marshall
Randall S Marshall

RECEIVED
JAN 23 2002
MAIL ROOM

Appl. No. 09/422,107

Filed October 20, 1999

Applicant: Randall S. Marshall



RKent
3/20/02
#12

Applicant's Response

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the interview extended by the examiner on or about November 27, 2001 and again on January 16, 2002, subsequent to the Advisory Action of October 30, 2001. Pursuant to working discussions between applicant and the examiner, applicant submits claims (thrice amended) for examiner's review, accordingly. Applicant hopes that the application is placed in a more favorable position.

RECEIVED
JAN 23 2002
TC 3700 MAIL ROOM

Comments

According to the above-mentioned Advisory Action of October 30, 2001, the proposed amendment to the claims were not entered because the examiner stated that they raise new issues which involve the definition of the term "boards". Further, the examiner urges that applicant also raises the importance of the "boards" having "five or more perpendicular sides", which are not disclosed in the claims. The said Advisory Action then gives the status of the claims "1-9", rejected for the purpose of Appeal. The said Advisory Action saith no more. It is assumed that the 103 art rejections are satisfied,

thus applicant attempts to satisfy the rejection of the claims in referenced to the term "boards" and the language "five or more perpendicular sides".

Claims 10 through 12 are being cancelled, leaving active, claims 1 through 9.

The objection to the term "boards" is corrected by returning to the original recitation "boxes" that is defined by the proposed language (in bold type).

In regards to the proposed phraseology "five or more perpendicular sides", in attempts to overcome the 35USC§112 rejections of the terminology "perpendicular-like", in claims 1 through 9, the phase is amended by proposing the language "five or more perpendicular lines".

In reference to the final objection to improper multiple claim dependency for claims 10 through 12, the embodiments of these claims are incorporated into several independent claims, and these claims are being cancelled.

Claims 1 through 9, consequently, are rewritten to more clearly define the invention and to help understand the invention as presented.